

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP91-00901R000400190018-8
ARTICLE APPEARED ON PAGE C1 THE WASHINGTON STAR (GREEN LINE)
6 May 1981

Political Folks, Energetic Strokes at Evans' Opening

By Lois Romano
Washington Star Staff Writer

Energy. That's the name of the game for Mary Page Evans, the artist wife of Rep. Tom Evans, R-Del., whose collection of paintings and pastels opened last night at the Hull Gallery here.

"I want to pass on energy so that people feel alive when they see my paintings," says the feisty 44-year-old artist, surveying her work at the gallery. "I think life is one big celebration and I want everyone to celebrate life in art the way I do."

Appearing at the exhibit's opening-night festivities were a slew of big-name Grand Old Partygoers and pals of her husband, such as Elliot Richardson, John Mitchell, Rep. Jack Kemp, R-N.Y., and CIA Director Bill Casey — most of whom went on to a dinner for Evans given by Ford's Theater producer Frankie Hewitt.

EXCERPTED

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-1

NEW YORK TIMES
3 MAY 1981

U.S. TRIES TO BACK UP HAIG ON TERRORISM

But Repeated Intelligence Studies
Find No Direct Link to Soviet

By PHILIP TAUBMAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 2— In late January, eight days after the inauguration of President Reagan and three days after the new Administration's first Cabinet-level meeting on terrorism, Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr. accused the Soviet Union of "training, funding and equipping" international terrorists.

His words caught the Government's intelligence agencies by surprise. Now, three months later, with resistance to terrorism firmly established as a main focus of foreign policy, the agencies are still scrambling to catch up with Mr. Haig's comments, intelligence officials said.

An intelligence report on terrorism, begun after Mr. Haig had spoken, is nearing completion after several false starts. Officials said that it supported some but not all of Mr. Haig's sweeping charges.

That gap is one of several problems that have dogged the policy on terrorism since it began evolving in January. The Administration's pronouncements about fighting terrorism, for example, exceed its ability to predict, prevent and respond to terrorist acts, a review of State Department, Defense Department and intelligence agency capabilities shows.

Administration spokesmen have also been imprecise in defining terrorism, scholars who study the subject said, leading to public confusion about exactly what the policy covers.

The policy on terrorism was enunciated before State Department officials had fully considered how it would mesh with other policies, including relations with the Soviet Union. Some officials question whether terrorism is an appropriate focus for the foreign policy of the United States.

As a result, Administration officials acknowledged, an effort to create a forceful and popular policy about a serious international problem has failed to crystallize.

Interviews with officials at the White House, State Department, Defense Department and intelligence agencies indicate that the underlying source of difficulty was a failure to coordinate preparatory work on the policy.

When President Reagan's National Security Council, the senior body formulating foreign policy, held its first meeting on Jan. 28, terrorism was the main subject on the agenda.

The American hostages held in Iran for more than a year had been freed the week before, and terrorism was on everyone's mind, officials recalled. The participants, including President Reagan, Vice President Bush and the Secretaries of State and Defense, were briefed in the Cabinet Room of the White House by Anthony C. E. Quainton, director of the State Department's Office for Combating Terrorism.

Need for Forceful Policy Seen

No specific decisions were made, officials said. The participants agreed that the Administration should develop a forceful policy, and a review of intelligence information and collection capabilities was proposed.

The next day, Mr. Reagan welcomed the former hostages at the White House and declared, "Let terrorists be aware that when the rules of international behavior are violated, our policy will be one of swift and effective retribution."

On Jan. 28, Mr. Haig, appearing at his first news conference as Secretary of State, made the charges against the Soviet Union.

"International terrorism will take the place of human rights in our concern because it is the ultimate abuse of human rights," he said after having accused the Soviet Union with supporting terrorism.

Later, Mr. Haig added that the Russians "are involved in conscious policy, in programs, if you will, which foster, support and expand" terrorism.

The remarks, made in response to questions, seemed to be a major pronouncement by the new Administration and marked a significant shift from the Carter Administration's emphasis on human rights.

Two Key Questions Unresolved

They immediately raised two questions: What did Mr. Haig mean by terrorism? What evidence did he have to support the charges against the Soviet Union? Neither question has been resolved.

By not defining terrorism, experts said, Mr. Haig left unclear whether he meant traditional terrorist groups such as the Red Brigades in Italy and the Red Army in Japan, and classical forms of terrorism such as airplane hijackings and bombings, or whether he had a broader definition in mind that would include insurgent movements and wars of national liberation.

"Haig made a sweeping statement," said Walter Laqueur, professor of political science at Georgetown University. "He seemed to make terrorism synonymous with all forms of political violence. One should be a bit more careful."

Brian M. Jenkins, who directs research on political violence at the Rand Corporation, said Mr. Haig might have kept his remarks general because he hoped to use the label of terrorist as a political weapon against the Soviet Union.

Wrong Focus for Foreign Policy

The ambiguity left the impression that a major priority of American foreign policy might be to combat airplane hijackings, bombings and political kidnappings and assassinations, a goal that troubled many officials.

"Combating terrorism is a police problem," said Mr. Laqueur. "It is not a problem for the foreign minister of a global power."

The questions about definitions spilled over into the intelligence community, where analysts were uncertain whether Mr. Haig was accusing the Soviet Union of directing individual terrorist groups or more generally supporting terrorism.

At the Central Intelligence Agency, senior officials, apparently surprised by the remarks, ordered a review of intelligence on terrorism. The first draft was rejected by William J. Casey, the Director of Central Intelligence, officials said.

Analysts complained that Mr. Casey had considered the draft faulty because it did not support Mr. Haig's assertions. Sources close to Mr. Casey said he felt the report had lacked substance and had been poorly prepared.

Second Report Found Inadequate

Mr. Casey then asked the Defense Intelligence Agency to prepare a report on terrorism. That was finished recently, but was also found by Mr. Casey and other officials to be incomplete.

Intelligence officials said a third and final report was now being prepared, incorporating new material as well as sections of the two previous papers, and would be sent to the President soon.

This final report, according to officials familiar with it, concludes that the Soviet Union has not played a direct role in training or equipping traditional terrorist groups such as the Red Brigades or the Red Army and has no master plan to create terrorism around the world.

It does find that the Soviet Union has provided aid to organizations and nations, including the Palestine Liberation Organization and Libya, that support terrorism and engage in it themselves.

Haig Is Said to Overstate Case

"Haig was generally correct, but he overstated the case," an intelligence official said, adding...

CONTINUED

Increased Emphasis on Intelligence Support

CONGRATULATIONS to AFCEA on its 35th anniversary, and best wishes for your continued success.

While somewhat new in my present position, I am well aware of the vital contributions to our national security made by the many companies which supply our communications and data systems, without which we could not fulfill our responsibilities.

In the period ahead, we will continue to place increasing emphasis on intelligence support to the policy makers of our nation. The demand for intelligence will continue to grow in direct proportion to our continuing concern with political and military developments outside our borders and to the ever expanding international problems in areas such as international terrorism, technology transfer, energy, narcotics and the many other important concerns facing all nations. These will not only place a heavy demand on our budget but will at the same time challenge us to produce new and innovative solutions.

Our effectiveness will depend in large measure on the continuing and ever increasing working relationships with many organizations, but, in particular, with elements of the Department of Defense and the com-

*William J. Casey
Director, Central
Intelligence Agency*



panies supporting AFCEA. We are dedicated to our mission and will continue to enlist assistance in meeting the intelligence challenges of the 80s. Again, thank you for the opportunity to give you some thoughts on the intelligence community. You have my continuing good wishes.